

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Figures 1 and 2 have been amended herewith to add a legend of "BACKGROUND ART".

Attachment:    Replacement Sheet  
                        Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 6-8 and 17-19 are now pending in the present application. Claims 6-8 and 17 have been amended, and Claims 1-5, 9-15 and 20-22 have been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. Obvious-Type Double Patenting**

Claims 1-22 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262 (hereinafter the ‘262 patent). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants are submitting concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer in order to overcome such rejection.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-22 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting has been overcome.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as such claims have been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Guo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,582), hereinafter “Guo”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5, 9-15 and 20-22 have been cancelled herewith, without prejudice or disclaimer.

With respect to independent Claims 6 and 17, Applicants have amended such claims in accordance with the preferred embodiment depicted in Figures 5 and 6 and described in the Specification at pages 9-12, whereby a single user registry adapter framework (URAF) interface router operably coupled to a plurality of servers and facilitates the selection of a given registry adapter and associated registry from amongst a plurality of registries and registry adapters, to thereby provide a common interface – from the servers perspective – to access multiple ones of the registries to thereby facilitate

providing support for a plurality of heterogeneous servers and a plurality of heterogeneous registries using the common interface provided by the single user registry adapter framework interface router.

In contrast, the cited Guo reference teaches use of a single, unitary, centralized authentication database (Guo col. 4, lines 46-63) that is used to centrally authenticate users (Guo col. 4, line 64 – col. 5, line 6; col. 9, lines 26-42). To the extent that Guo teaches redirection of a user for authentication purposes, the user is *always* redirected to the *same* central authentication system that uses the *same* centralized authentication database (Guo col. 9, lines 10-42). Thus, Guo does not teach or otherwise suggest a single URAF interface/router that is operably coupled to a plurality of servers and facilitates the selection of a given registry and associated registry adapter from amongst a plurality of registries and registry adapters in order to authenticate a user, as per the features of the amended claims.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants